

## Seven Corners Plan Amendment PA 2013-I-B2

### 7/15/2013 Planning Commission Motions & Background Information

By a vote of 11-0 (Commissioner Lawrence was absent from the meeting), the Planning Commission voted on July 15, 2015 that the Board of Supervisors adopt Plan Amendment PA 2013-I-B2 as recommended in the staff report dated April 3, 2015, as modified by the motions listed below. The referenced July 15, 2015 handout, as adopted, is available [here](#).

Motion	Planning Commission Recommended Motion	Background
1	<p><b>Motion:</b> To address the community's concerns about the proposed residential density, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors a 20% reduction of residential square footage for Land Unit B only, as shown in my handout, dated July 15, 2015.</p> <p><b>Modify</b> Page 42 of 97 of the staff report:  <i>"The form-based approach utilizes a maximum total development potential which applies to each individual sub-unit within the Opportunity Areas in the Seven Corners CBC. Capacity for any individual development will be dependent on satisfaction of criteria outlined within the Comprehensive Plan that support the best quality redevelopment of these areas. The total available development potential of the Opportunity Areas combined is approximately <del>7.6 million</del> <u>7 million</u> square feet (sf), with an allocation of square footage among the different sub-units and land uses as indicated in Figure 26. As a result, the approximate overall total build-out for the entire CBC is <del>10.3 million</del> <u>9.8 million square feet</u>."</i></p> <p><b>Modify</b> Figure 26 on Page 42 of the staff report. [See Table on page 12 of this document]</p> <p><b>Modify</b> Pages 91 and 92 of the staff report:  <i>"This land unit (Land Unit B) is planned for mixed use development at a maximum of <del>3,800,000 square feet</del> <u>3,310,000 square feet</u>. Approximately two-thirds of the development should be residential use, with the remaining development comprised or retail, office, or hotel uses."</i></p>	<p>The total square footages (FARs were not used in the Seven Corners process) for the different uses in the three opportunity areas were determined through stakeholder-led processes that included a task force and a special working group along with extensive community input. The groups met over the course of three years and included a wide range of community participation opportunities including over 85 monthly meetings, design charrettes, open houses, community meetings, and presentations as well as updated information online. The amount and mix of proposed development began through a charrette process. Teams, who were guided by certain principles and goals, developed design ideas for a future Seven Corners area in terms of character, street network, types of uses, major focal points, and building height. These design ideas were refined into concept plans from which square footages were then quantified. Additional guidance was sought from experts to confirm that the concepts were viable from an economic and infrastructure perspective.</p> <p>While recognizing that the plan represents years of effort and reflects the work of the Seven Corners Task Force and the Opportunity Area C Working Group, in order to address community concerns, some reduction in density may be appropriate in the most intensely planned area of the Plan, Land</p>

		<p>Unit B, which is planned as the future town center for Seven Corners. Therefore, a 20% reduction of residential square footage is recommended for Land Unit B only. Development intensities in Land Unit C were previously reduced as a result of the recommendations provided by the Opportunity Area C Working Group. Land Unit A should not be reduced since proposed densities are presently more than 25 percent lower than that planned for Land Unit B. Moreover, the recommendation to replace all of Land Unit A's 589 affordable housing units in Land Unit A at the time of redevelopment requires economic incentives estimated to be three market rate units for each affordable unit to be viable.</p>
2	<p><b>Motion:</b> To address community concerns regarding the loss of the existing athletic field in Land Unit A, I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of Supervisors the following modifications to the Plan text as shown in my handout, dated July 15, 2015.</p> <p><b>Modify</b> Figure 42 on Page 86 of 97 of the staff report: [See Figure on page 16 of this document]</p> <p><i>"Collocated with Future <u>Redevelopment</u> <del>Redeveloped Willston Multicultural Center</del>"</i></p> <p><b>Modify</b> text on Page 87 of 97 of the staff report:</p> <p><i>"<u>A portion of the active</u> <del>Active</del> recreation needs in the Seven Corners CBC <del>are</del> is envisioned to be addressed through the provision of athletic fields to serve local residents, visitors, and workers. <u>The existing athletic field located on the Willston Multicultural Center site should be replaced and improved with the redevelopment of Sub-unit A-3. In addition to the existing rectangle replacement of the athletic field that will be, replaced through the future Willston Multicultural Center redevelopment,</u> a second athletic field is needed. This new athletic field is envisioned to be provided in Land Unit A in order to support redevelopment growth throughout the Seven Corners CBC. These</i></p>	<p>The graphic for the Park and Recreation Concept Plan (Figure 42) includes a notation that the replacement of the existing field will be collocated with the Future Redeveloped Willston Multicultural Center. The replacement of the existing field should not be specifically or exclusively tied to the redevelopment of the Willston Multicultural Center. Therefore, it is appropriate to modify Figure 42 to denote that the athletic field should be collocated with future development and the reference to the Willston Multicultural Center should be removed.</p>

July 22, 2015

	<i>athletic fields will support both scheduled and informal uses by individuals and groups, and a variety of activities and sports.”</i>	
3	<p><b>Motion:</b> To address the community’s concerns regarding the proposed screening and buffering text in Land Unit C pertaining to the established residential neighborhood, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors make the following modification to the Plan text as shown in my handout, dated July 15, 2015.</p> <p><b>Modify</b> text on Page 45 of 97 of the staff report:</p> <p><i>“...This Opportunity Area is envisioned to be a mixed-use village that provides higher building heights along Leesburg Pike with buildings along the residential periphery of the site limited to townhouses that are up to three stories in height. Appropriate transitions in building form, materials and type should be used to transition to and preserve the character of the existing neighborhoods. <del>Appropriate buffering and screening should be provided between this land unit and the adjacent residential neighborhoods, including the Shadeland Drive cul-du-sac in order to visually screen the new uses from the existing uses....”</del></i></p> <p><b>Modify</b> text on Page 93 of 97 of the staff report:</p> <p><i>“To avoid cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets in Sleepy Hollow Manor, Ravenwood, and Ravenwood Park, trips generated by uses located north of Juniper Lane should be directed to and from Leesburg Pike for ingress and egress. Trips generated by uses located north of Juniper Lane should be prohibited from accessing Juniper Lane. For parcels south of Juniper Lane, access should be to Juniper Lane and not to Patrick Henry Drive. No vehicular or pedestrian connections are envisioned to Shadeland Drive from this land unit. To protect and maintain the existing character of the neighborhoods, Shadeland Drive should remain as a cul-de-sac with no vehicular or pedestrian connections to Land Unit C. <del>Screening and buffering should be provided that meet or exceeds the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Elements that visually block new construction are to be provided and maintained between Land Unit C and the adjacent neighborhoods.”</del></i></p>	<p>Modified Plan text is recommended pursuant to the community’s request to delete this language regarding the proposed screening and buffering text in Land Unit C pertaining to the established residential neighborhood.</p>

4

**Motion:** In response to community concerns, an alternative recommendation, Option B, for the Willston Multicultural Center site has been provided that would expand public facility uses on the site to include education, cultural, governmental and/or human services use to support the local community. I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the adoption of Option B as noted on pages 44, 90, and 91 of the staff report as shown in my handout, dated July 15, 2015.

**Adopt** Text Option B on Page 44 of 97 of the staff report:

*“Currently the site of the Willston Multicultural Center, surface parking, the Willston I Shopping Center, the Seven Corners Apartments, and the East Falls Church Apartments, this Opportunity Area is envisioned to be more neighborhood-serving and smaller in scale than the Town Center. This area is planned to be organized around a village main street where ground-floor retail, an urban plaza, outdoor dining areas, and community uses will be concentrated to create a lively, pedestrian-friendly environment. The Willston Multicultural Center may be redeveloped as office or a public facility use such as an educational, cultural, governmental, and/or human services use to support the local community. Architecture should provide varied rooflines, use of balconies, ~~and~~ bays, and articulated building facades, and reflect a residential character. Distinctive architectural treatment of ground-floor uses should distinguish the different uses. The village main street is planned to connect the spine road to Patrick Henry Drive to create an important vehicular link and provide a continuously activated pedestrian space that serves as a focal point for the village. The neighborhood surrounding the main street should consist of medium to higher residential development in buildings that frame the streets. Heights should transition to be compatible with existing, nearby residential development and be consistent with the Maximum Building Heights Map (Figure 27). Additional pocket parks should be provided in this area along with an athletic field that is separate from, but connected to, the existing Upton Hill Regional Park.”*

**Adopt** Text Option B on Pages 90 and 91 of 97 of the staff report:

*“Under the Redevelopment Option, this area is planned to become the heart*

The Planning Commission recommended text that specifies a public school as a potential use. To confirm the possibility that a school could be located on the site, on July 15, 2015, Fairfax County Public Schools Superintendent Karen Garza and Fairfax County Executive Edward Long [submitted a letter](#) to the Planning Commission stating in part:

*“It is the intention of the County and FCPS to work together collaboratively to plan for the future public uses on the Willston Multicultural Center site. While detailed planning efforts remain to be done, both parties have an interest in locating an FCPS school on the site, colocated with other community services. These other uses might include non-profits such as those located in the current building, a formalized multicultural center, or other public uses compatible with a school and the mixed-use nature of the desired development.”*

	<p><i>of the Willston Village Center. A maximum of approximately 950,000 square feet is planned, with a mix of multifamily residential with ground floor retail, office/hotel use, and enhanced public open space. At least one-half of the total development should be residential use. The redevelopment of the Willston Multicultural Center for an educational, cultural, governmental, and/or human services uses is envisioned to provide needed facilities for the Seven Corners community. Building heights should be no taller than seven stories, with emphasis on creating a village-scaled main street parallel to Arlington Boulevard and Patrick Henry Drive. Redevelopment of this sub-unit should provide a recreation-focused urban park, a common green, and elements of the street network with streetscape. Design and/or contribution should be provided toward the construction of the spine road and bridge, and of other planned transportation improvements, both onsite and offsite. To foster coordinated development, flexibility in the shared A-1 and A-3 boundary line may be appropriate."</i></p>	
5	<p><b>Motion:</b> As noted on page 54 of the staff report, the Schools section offers two alternatives to consider. The first option reflects the original language developed by the Seven Corners Special Working Group. The second, which is recommended by staff, clarifies the intent to focus mitigation impacts on schools. I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the adoption of Option B as noted on page 54 of the staff report, in addition to the other modifications as noted in my handout dated July 15, 2015, as modified to add "to contribute."</p> <p><b>Adopt</b> Text Option B on Page 54 of 97 of the staff report:</p> <p><i>"SCHOOLS</i></p> <p><i>Traditionally, public school capacity needs have been addressed through various means including dedication of land, new school construction, additions to existing facilities, interior architectural modifications, use of modular buildings, changes to programs, and/or changes to attendance areas.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to traditional means for addressing school capacity requirements</i></p>	<p>Modified Plan text is recommended to clarify the intent to focus mitigation impacts on schools and to delete references to moving school programs such as SACC to off-site facilities.</p>

July 22, 2015

	<p><i>listed above, Fairfax County Public Schools should evaluate other possible “in-kind” school impact mitigation strategies <del>such as the utilization of private buildings to accommodate civic programs, adult education classes, and governmental/quasi-governmental school related programs such as Early Head Start, Head Start, and School Age Child Care (SACC) programs.</del></i></p> <p><u><i>The impact of development on schools should be mitigated by the developer(s) and the county. Any impact on schools, necessitated by any increased intensity, must be addressed with provisions for mitigation. The envisioned plan for growth there will contribute to a need for a new elementary school, as well as capacity enhancements at the middle and high school levels.”</i></u></p>	
6	<p><b>Motion:</b> I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the following editorial revision of the Plan text as attached in my handout, dated July 15, 2015.</p> <p><b>Insert</b> a title block for Figure 25 on Page 41 of 97 of the staff report.</p> <p><b>Insert</b> “CBC” into the title block for Figure 28 on Page 44 of 97 of the staff report.</p>	Modified Plan text is recommended to provide clarification for Figure 26 and Figure 28 of the staff report.
7	<p><b>Motion:</b> To underscore that the draft text is intended to address only the area proximate to Seven Corners, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the following modification to the Plan text as shown in my handout, dated July 15, 2015.</p> <p><b>Modify</b> text on Page 59 of 97 of the staff report:</p> <p><i>“Arlington Boulevard widened to six lanes from the Arlington/Fairfax County line, <u>westward, through the Seven Corners interchange.</u> <del>to the City of Fairfax.</del>”</i></p>	Modified language is recommended to emphasize that the language associated with the widening of Arlington Boulevard in the Plan text is intended to address the area proximate to Seven Corners only.
8	<p><b>Motion:</b> In response to community concerns regarding the potential displacement of families living in affordable housing, I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the following modification to page 47 of the staff report as noted in my handout dated July 15, 2015.</p>	<p>The motion responds to community suggestions that potential redevelopment of Sub-units A-1 and A-2 should provide housing opportunities for existing tenants.</p> <p>See also additional background for Follow-On Motion #10</p>

	<p><b>Modify</b> text on Page 47 of 97 of the staff report:</p> <p><i>“In Sub-units A-1 and A-2, a 1:1 replacement of affordable residential units within the development area is expected. <u>As recommended by the Fairfax County Relocation Guidelines, proposed redevelopment should incorporate a Relocation Assistance Plan so as to minimize displacement of the tenants and to provide fair, consistent, and equitable treatment of displaced persons. The Plan should be prepared by the developer and submitted to the Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development, as specified in the guidelines. Guiding principles should include limited involuntary displacement, using vacancies by attrition, where possible, and temporary housing; with relocation and assistance costs to be borne by the landowners. Projects with a substantial residential component...</u>”</i></p> <p>See Follow-On Motion #10 within PC Motion #10 below.</p>	
9	<p><b>Motion:</b> A new form-based Comprehensive Plan for the Seven Corners CBC has been provided that could foster revitalization and redevelopment efforts. I move that the Planning Commission endorse all other components of the Seven Corners Community Business Center Plan Amendment 2013-I-B2 as found on pages 35 to 97 of the staff report, and recommend its adoption to the Board of Supervisors. I also move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors the additional editorial and map changes to the Baileys and Jefferson Planning Districts, as noted on pages 23 to 34 of the staff report.</p>	<p>This motion endorses all other text and maps proposed in the Plan and recommends its adoption to the Board of Supervisors.</p>
10	<p><b>Motion:</b> There are a series of Follow-On Motions that have been developed to address a number of issues that the community has expressed interest in, primarily dealing with affordable housing, transportation and funding. I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of these Follow-On Motions as shown in my handout dated July 15, 2015.</p>	<p>Ten Follow-On Motions are recommended to address implementation, transportation planning and funding, urban design and affordable housing. Aspects of the motions were tailored to address community concerns. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To ensure opportunities for participation in the implementation of the Seven Corners Comprehensive Plan, community representatives from the City of Falls Church and the Fairfax County Mason District are included in the Steering Committee described in Follow-On Motion #1.</li> </ol>



Follow-On Motions:

1. The Board will establish a Seven Corners Implementation Steering Committee, consisting of members of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Falls Church City Council, and community representatives from both Fairfax County and Falls Church City to guide the implementation of the redevelopment, public facilities, and vision set forth in the Seven Corners Comprehensive Plan. Community representatives will be appointed by each area's respective elected official.
2. The Board directs staff to establish a Seven Corners working group, consisting of members of Fairfax County Department of Transportation, Department of Planning & Zoning, Office of Community Revitalization, Department of Housing and Community Development, and Falls Church City Staff, to guide the implementation of the redevelopment, public facilities and vision set forth in the Seven Corners Comprehensive Plan.
3. The Board directs staff to work with the City of Falls Church to identify and address the challenges associated with transitioning from recommendations in the Seven Corners Comprehensive Plan through the gateways into Falls Church City.
4. The Board directs staff to conduct a phasing analysis and develop a funding plan for the transportation improvements recommended in the Seven Corners Comprehensive Plan. This effort would result in the following:
  - Cost estimates for road and other transportation improvements recommended in the Plan.
  - Recommendations on the projected order in which transportation improvements should be implemented to maintain a balance between the future development of Seven Corners and the associated transportation infrastructure over time.
  - Conceptual plans for phased implementation of the road improvements, including the entire ring road network, with time duration and estimated costs of each project.

2. To acknowledge the need to consider affordable housing issues, the Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development was added to the staff working group described in Follow-on Motion #2.
3. Follow-On Motion #4 addresses transportation phasing analysis, cost estimates, and funding. More information is provided in the section specific to the motion below.
4. A new Follow-on Motion #10 was created requesting a review of the overall County affordable housing policy. More information is provided in the section specific to the motion below.

Suggestions were received that cost estimates, time frames and potential funding sources of road improvements should be provided within a certain time. This motion incorporates the major components but allows necessary flexibility in timing to allow cost estimates to be developed concurrent with project phasing.



July 22, 2015

- Descriptions of funding sources and estimates of funds available from each source, based on similar experience elsewhere in the County.
5. The Board directs staff to work with the City of Falls Church and the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission to encourage the completion of the Route 7 Transit Alternatives Study and bring the recommendations forward to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan.
  6. The Board directs staff to further study the grid of streets proposed in the Seven Corners Conceptual Street Network to determine right-of-way needs.
  7. The Board directs staff to utilize existing funding dedicated to Seven Corners transportation improvements, as well as identify necessary additional funding, to move forward on the design, engineering, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the Seven Corners Interchange project.
  8. The Board directs staff to create guidelines that provide additional detail on how to incorporate Seven Corners specific urban design and streetscape features into future development, as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.
  9. The Board directs staff to conduct a traffic analysis of the roadway network in the vicinity of Juniper Lane and Patrick Henry Drive. This analysis should identify potential strategies to limit cut-through traffic and reduce possible traffic impacts generated by future development to the surrounding residential neighborhoods, while improving connectivity within these neighborhoods. Options to evaluate should include, but not be limited to, the closing of Juniper Lane with or without the possible extension of Nicholson Street to Juniper Lane, the realignment of Juniper Lane at its connection to Patrick Henry Drive, and should engage the residential communities in the vicinity of Juniper Lane, Patrick Henry Drive and Nicholson Street to develop final recommendations. Such an analysis should identify options to maintain adequate access between

Juniper Lane and Patrick Henry Drive to both east and westbound Rt.7 traffic without degrading traffic operations on Patrick Henry Drive or Juniper Lane. This analysis should be conducted prior to or concurrent with rezoning applications for properties located within the Leesburg Pike Village, also known as Land Area C, as defined in the Opportunity Areas Section, and is recommended to be completed within one year of Plan adoption.

10. The Board, together with the Department of Housing and Community Development, and Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority, will engage in a discussion of development and preservation of housing targeted to households earning 60% of Area Media Income or less. The discussion will include a review of affordable housing policy as well as consideration of public funding or other financing tools.

The purpose of this motion is to encourage discussion of whether County policy regarding affordable housing and funding tend to limit the ability of lower income tenants to remain in redeveloping areas. For Seven Corners, a response to this concern is in motion #8, which recommends the use of Relocation Plans to “minimize displacement of the tenants and to provide fair, consistent, and equitable treatment of displaced persons.” However, a broader discussion of housing policy is also recommended to more fully explore these issues.

The primary focus of the Seven Corners’ concern is the potential redevelopment of 589 existing affordable units in Sub-units A-1 and A-2. These units are a mix of 305 units made affordable by tax credit financing and 284 units, built in 1951, that are market affordable due to age. The monthly rent of all 589 units is affordable to households earning 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI), which is \$65,500 for a family of four. It is important to note that the market affordable units are not income restricted. They are available to any qualified tenant as there is no restriction on maximum household income.

The proposed Plan would create approximately 1,000 new units. Following County policy, these would be affordable to families with incomes ranging from at or below 60% AMI up to a maximum of 120% AMI. The units would be dispersed throughout the three land units recommended for redevelopment. The 1,000 units would be supplemented by 332 existing committed affordable housing units in the areas of the CBC that are outside of Land Units

A, B and C.

The concern is that the income tiers may “price out” some residents if redevelopment occurs, given the proportion allocated to lower income levels. Ideas to address this potential outcome included replacing all 589 units at 60% or below AMI, but eliminating all other affordable units; recommending income limits of 60-80% AMI for the 589 units; or providing additional funding or relaxing site design requirements or expectations to mitigate impacts in order to reduce costs.

The goals of the Plan in recommending a broader range of income tiers are to use a mix of incomes to create opportunities for individuals or families to have housing to move into as their incomes increase. The range also facilitates the creation of a sustainable mixed-use, mixed income community.

With the redevelopment of these areas, as shown in the table below, there would be 134 units at 60% AMI, 201 units at 70% AMI and 336 units at 80% AMI for a total of 671 units available to low and moderate income households, serving a minimum of 82 more individuals or families than the existing 589 units. Unlike nearly half of the 589 existing units, which have no assurance of continuation, the new privately owned and operated affordable units would be monitored for compliance by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) under the County’s affordable housing programs (ADUs and WDUs). Households would be required to income qualify, ensuring that low and moderate income households are being served. Assuming private sector redevelopment and management, the owner would be required to make monthly reports to HCD for monitoring purposes. In addition, these units would be dispersed throughout the community rather than concentrated in one area.

The table below also shows those units at the higher income tiers consistent with County policy, which was developed prior to the

2008 economic downturn when housing costs were much higher, and which states: "Affordable housing for the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is defined as housing that is affordable to households with incomes which are up to 120% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area, as determined periodically by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. One of the Fairfax County programs designed to produce affordable housing is the Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) Program, which produces units that are affordable to households with incomes that are 70% or less of the AMI."

#### Income Tiers

(Based on Revised Figure 26)

	A-1	A-2	A-3	B	C	Totals
120% (2%)	40	38	11	38	--	127
100% (3%)	61	57	17	57	7	199
80% (5%)	102	95	28	94	17	336
70% (3%)	61	57	17	57	9	201
60% (2%)	40	38	11	38	7	134
TOTAL	304	284	84	284	40	997

The additional units to be set aside at 100% and 120% of AMI would be at or above market rate. In today's market, those units do not provide any additional benefit in terms of affordability. At some point in the future though, if rents continue to increase faster than household income, there will be a benefit.

According to the Center for Housing Research at Virginia Tech, the total affordable housing gap in Fairfax County for low- and moderate-income renters (earning 80% of AMI and below) is approximately 31,360 units. Based on job growth and housing data prepared by the Center for Regional Analysis at George Mason University, it is estimated that there is a need for approximately 49,284 net new affordable units for households

earning up to \$124,000 per year (slightly over 115% of the AMI) by 2032. Taken together, this represents a need for nearly 82,000 units of affordable workforce housing in Fairfax County within the next 18 years. The Plan needs to create an environment for redevelopment that not only preserves existing affordable housing but that also facilitates the addition of new units at the various income brackets including the higher income tiers up to 120%.

It should be noted there is nothing in the Plan text that prohibits a developer from providing a greater number of replacement affordable units to serve those at lower income tiers, 60% AMI or below. However, a developer may not propose to have fewer units in a lower tier in order to put those units in higher tiers. There is also nothing in the Plan text that prohibits Public Private Partnerships (PPEA), the use of Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) or partnering with the County, all of which are consistent with County policy to increase affordable housing.

Some of the community-suggested strategies for Seven Corners would require a financial commitment by the County. However, since these recommendations would seek to obligate future Board of Supervisors or the Fairfax County Redevelopment Housing Authority Board to make or fund specific projects, they are not appropriately placed in the Comprehensive Plan.

To reiterate, the Plan provides a greater number of affordable units and ensures that a minimum number of units will remain available at all times to the lower income tiers, as well as households at the 80% (and higher) so that an opportunity to remain in the community would exist.

The Plan language found in draft Seven Corners Comprehensive Plan is in conformance with the County's existing housing policy on affordable and workforce housing. However, in response to concerns and suggestions offered by the community, Coalition for Smarter Growth and AHome, Follow-on Motion #10 requests a

July 22, 2015

		discussion of the overall County affordable housing policy.

**Revised Figure 26 (Reference Motion #1)**

Opportunity Area		Existing Development <sup>6</sup>		Redevelopment Option			
		Residential (DU)	Nonresidential (sf)	Residential (sf) <sup>1</sup>	Retail (sf)	Office/Hotel (sf)	TOTAL (sf)
Willston Village Center	Sub-unit A-1	589	0	1,200,000	0 <sup>2</sup>	0	3,151,000
	Sub-unit A-2		0	1,000,000	0	0	
	Sub-unit A-3		134,358	560,000	191,000	200,000	
Town Center	Land Unit B	0	630,199	<del>2,450,000</del> <u>1,960,000</u>	625,000	725,000	<del>3,800,000</del> <u>3,310,000</u>
Leesburg Pike Village	Land Unit C	0	265,869	404,000 <sup>3</sup>	85,000 <sup>4</sup>	50,000 <sup>5</sup>	539,000
<b>TOTAL</b> Revised Figure 42 (Reference Motion #2)		<b>589</b>	<b>1,030,426</b>	<del><b>5,614,000</b></del> <u><b>5,124,000</b></u>	<b>901,000</b>	<b>975,000</b>	<del><b>7,490,000</b></del> <u><b>7,000,000</b></u>

<sup>1</sup> Assumed Residential Unit Size: 1,000 sf per multifamily unit; 2,000 sf per townhouse unit.

<sup>2</sup> There is an additional option in Sub-unit A-1 to permit up to 190,000 sf of retail along the planned spine road with a commensurate reduction in residential square footage to 1,010,000.

<sup>3</sup> Up to 129,000 sf for townhouse single-family residential, up to 275,000 sf for multi-family residential.

<sup>4</sup> Approximately 40,000 sf for retail, and approximately 45,000 sf for theater/entertainment retail.

<sup>5</sup> There is an additional option in Land Unit C to permit up to 100,000 sf of additional non-residential use with a commensurate reduction in residential square footage to 304,000 sf, and not to exceed the overall land unit cap.

<sup>6</sup> Numbers based on 2012 Seven Corners CBC Existing Conditions Report.



Revised Figure 42 (Reference Motion #2)

